

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. Claim 18 has been amended, and claims 27-28 have been canceled. New claims 29-38 have been added. Claims 18-26 and 29-38 are pending and in condition for allowance.

#### **Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action asserts that claim 27 is not limited to tangible embodiments because the claimed computer-readable medium is not limited to computer storage media. Applicants have canceled claim 27, so the § 101 rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

#### **Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)**

Claims 18-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,956,733 to Nakano et al. ("Nakano"). Applicants have amended independent claim 18 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention over Nakano.

Nakano is directed to "a network archiver system for compressing a data file, storing the compressed data file into an archiver, reconstructing the compression data file, and referring to such a data file." Nakano, col. 1, ll. 10-16. The Background of the Invention and the Summary of the Invention make clear that a primary application of Nakano's system is for data and information sharing over a network by enterprise users. Nakano, col. 1, l. 17 – col. 2, 47.

In contrast to Nakano, independent claim 18 is directed to a method of archiving within a client management tool. Further, claim 18 recites: “receiving an entry selection indicative of a user selection to archive client management data” (emphasis added). Nakano does not disclose archiving within a client management tool and does not disclose archiving client management data. Thus, Nakano also fails to disclose the following additional recitations from original claim 18: “obtaining a selection of a set of client management data; and creating the selected archive file within the client management tool.”

To expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 18 to even more explicitly capture the differences between the claimed invention and Nakano. First, the preamble of claim 18 has been amended to clarify that the claimed method occurs “within a client management tool that performs both a client management function and an archiving function.” Further, claim 18 has been amended to specify that “the client management data comprises at least one of capacity planning data or performance monitoring data.” Nakano also fails to disclose these additional claim limitations of amended claim 18.

Claim 18, as amended, is patentable over the art of record, including Nakano. Given the differences between claim 18 and Nakano noted above, it is clear that Nakano does not anticipate claim 18. Moreover, because Nakano does not teach or suggest archiving within a client management tool nor archiving client management data comprising capacity planning data and/or performance monitoring data, Nakano also fails to render claim 18 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and allowance of claim 18.

Dependent claims 19-26 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 18 and are patentable for at least the reasons noted above for independent claim 18. Furthermore,

claims 19-26 recite additional limitations in the context of claim 18 not found in Nakano and are therefore separately patentable. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and allowance of these claims.

### **New Claims 29-38**

Applicants have added new claims 29-38. New independent claim 29 is directed to a computer storage medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of archiving within a client management tool that performs both a client management function and an archiving function. New claims 30-37 depend directly or indirectly from claim 28. New independent claim 38 is directed to a computer system operable to execute a method of archiving within a client management tool that performs both a client management function and an archiving function. As such, new claims 29-38 are also patentable over Nakano.

## **CONCLUSION**

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 18-26 and 29-38 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or [plujin@shb.com](mailto:plujin@shb.com) (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick A. Lujin/

Patrick A. Lujin  
Reg. No. 35,260

PAL/bp  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613  
816-474-6550